

JAN 16 1942

EDICAL ROOM
CAL LIBRARY
1942

Land policy REVIEW

Contents FOR JANUARY 1942 Vol. V No. 1

	Page
War and the Small Farmer	<i>D. R. Rush and</i> 3 <i>Pbillip F. Aylesworth</i>
The Final Frontier	<i>John C. Page</i> 6
Notes from the Field	<i>Paul S. Taylor</i> 13
Faith in Democracy	<i>Eleanor Roosevelt</i> 20
A Farmer Plans for War	<i>R. S. Kifer</i> 23
Checks of Grazing Practice	<i>Charles B. Howe</i> 28
Arkansas' Land Policy	<i>William J. Coleman</i> 31
Books	<i>Caroline B. Sherman, Esther M. Colvin,</i> 36 <i>Harold Hedges</i>

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
145 BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS



Editorial Notes

CONTRIBUTORS: PAUL S. TAYLOR is professor of agricultural economics in the University of California at Berkeley and a member of the California State Board of Agriculture.

DONALD R. RUSH, a senior agricultural economist in the BAE division of farm management and costs, is working on the problem of low farm income. PHILLIP F. AYLESWORTH is assistant chief of the farm plan and loan section of Farm Security Administration.

WILLIAM J. COLEMAN is a legislative analyst in the South Central region, and the BAE representative on the Land Use Committee of the Arkansas Planning Board, which administers the State's Land Policy Act.

CHARLES B. HOWE, senior agricultural economist and specialist in grazing, works in the division of program development and coordination of BAE. R. S. KIFER, also a member of that division, formerly was a member of the division of farm management and costs, BAE.

CAROLINE B. SHERMAN and ESTHER M. COLVIN comprise the editorial section of the BAE division of economic information. HAROLD HEDGES is principal agricultural economist in the division of cooperative research and service, Farm Credit Administration.

THE INDEX to Volume IV of *LAND POLICY REVIEW*, sent to each person on the mailing list, reveals the scope of the magazine during the past year: 127 persons contributed articles, reviews, and letters; nearly 50 different subjects were discussed, all of them bearing on land policy and use.

WAR AND POST-WAR PLANNING were treated in 39 articles and letters. Much attention was paid also to nutrition, farm security, migration, conservation, and farm adjustments and finance. Thus, before war came, *LAND POLICY REVIEW* contributors, month by month, had outlined many of the problems that since have become much more actual.

IN THE MONTHS AHEAD, every effort will be directed toward victory; our best contribution, it now seems, will be as a forum for discussions of immediate and long-term policies and plans, rural welfare and production, and, most of all, agriculture's duties in the emergency and afterwards.

*General
Deposited by U. S. Govt.*

LAND • POLICY • REVIEW

Land Policy Review is published monthly by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture, with approval of the Bureau of the Budget. For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 5 cents a single copy, 50 cents a year

War AND THE LOW-INCOME FARMER

By DONALD R. RUSH and PHILLIP F. AYLESWORTH.
Given sufficient financial and supervisory help, low-income farmers can contribute an important share of the increased food production needed to win the war and write the peace.



ANY WAR makes big things bigger. The industrial economy expands. Labor shortages grow. Demands for almost all kinds of products increase.

And a big war accentuates the importance of large factories, a wide scale of operations, huge factory-farms. In all this, let us not forget the part of the small producer, the poor farmer, who can contribute much to winning the war and at the same time help themselves to gain a permanently useful place in our society.

They are small and poor because of the forces of submarginal land, pressure on land resources, rural underemployment, and low agricultural prices.

Such distress has been most painfully apparent in the hill lands of New England, the Appalachians, the Southeastern Piedmont and Coastal Plains, the Great Lakes cutover area,

the Ozarks, the Great Plains, the Spanish-American area of the Southwest, and the Pacific Northwest cutover localities.

Many persons from these impoverished places have gone to work on war jobs. Others have obtained nearby farm work through taking the place of defense workers. But it is improbable that the more remote areas have been very much influenced. For those remaining on the farms, price increases of agricultural commodities have brought a little more income for the small amount of produce they sell. But since such a large proportion of their production is for home use, the cash benefits from higher prices should not be expected to be so great as those enjoyed by the commercial farmer.

The Food for Freedom program presents an opportunity for low-income farmers to participate in the defense program.

They can increase the production of farm products for home use. Insofar as this represents a reduction of off-farm purchases, this will release such critical items as tin used in making cans and transportation and handling.

The low-income group can increase their production of products for sale by increased feeding and better care of livestock, proper use of seed and fertilizer, and by the use of improved agricultural practices. Special financing and supervisory programs to assist the low-income farmer in better utilization of his present resources are essential to these increases in efficiency.

Most higher-income farmers are using their resources nearer to maximum efficiency and the cost per unit of increase normally will be greater than for the group now using its resources poorly.

Small farmers often are located on the poorer lands suited to extensive types of agriculture. In the Northeast, for example, where dairying is a major enterprise, farmers located on poorer hill lands might raise heifers obtained from the better bred herds in the valleys. The valley farms often veal many of their heifers and buy mature cows for replacements. Much grass land is unused on some hill farms and on others the farmers are saving inferior young stock for replacements. Farmers in other areas with an inadequate land base and consequent underemployment, may be able to grow legume and vegetable seeds, enterprises requiring a large amount of labor. Seed production will require competent technical assistance and cooperative facilities for production and marketing in addition to

financing of necessary capital equipment.

Two precautions must be recognized in working out the contribution of low-income farm families in the defense program. They need guidance to prevent their farm organization from getting so much out of balance that their rehabilitation is endangered. They must make adjustments in accordance with feed resources, housing and equipment for handling the enterprise, local market conditions, and the managerial ability of the operator. Also, under the impetus of high prices, the family must not sell the products that it needs for good nutrition.

Help

If low-income farm families are to make the greatest contribution to the defense program and if they are to receive the maximum benefits from it, assistance must be given along the following lines: Increased supervision, more working capital, and other facilities to improve operating efficiency; increased development of group buying services for feed, seed, fertilizer, and the like; establishment of cooperative use of machinery to reduce costs of operation and permit fuller utilization of available machines; expansion of production for home use to improve nutrition and to hold down cash living costs.

The Farm Security Administration, for example, through financial aid plus farm and home management supervision, can make possible greater participation and greater contribution in the production goal program. FSA funds are being made available to low-income farmers for necessary workstock, building, machine repair, and operating require-

ments—all to help in this emergency. The goal for increased production of dairy and poultry products is in line with FSA efforts to encourage diversified enterprises that will permit utilization of the maximum amount of labor. Emphasis on farm gardens goes hand in hand with it. The higher farm prices will permit adjustments in organizations that will more adequately utilize the land, labor, and capital resources available to low-income farmers, adjustments typified by the reduction of cotton acreage in the South.

Adjustments

The defense program offers an immediate opportunity to bring about needed adjustments in areas where the lack of adequate resources has caused serious distress. The lessening of pressure for land and the possibilities of part-time employment will definitely affect a number of families needing assistance in agriculture. Part-time and full-time defense employment form a two-edged weapon against poverty. Farmers getting full-time employment leave land that can be used by remaining farmers to build up adequate sized farm units. Part-time employment can furnish cash income to build up adequate family income.

The increased demand for labor

now should permit permanent benefits to some members of the low-income group. Farmers located in subsistence and poor areas oftentimes possess considerable mechanical ingenuity. Therefore they should be offered rapid training and, when properly trained, they would be available to meet the pressing need for trained skilled workers in defense industries. The principal drawback is the lack of vocational training schools in remote areas. Needless to say, the prospective trainee needs to understand what he can expect in the way of employment so that he will be encouraged to take the training offered. Permanent vocational training schools cannot be justified in some areas because of the sparseness of population. To meet these situations, traveling training schools may be warranted.

There is also an opportunity of helping the rural labor situation, which has become particularly acute with farmers near defense centers. The underemployed and the unemployed workers in remote rural areas represent a reservoir of trained and untrained farm workers. Steps should be taken to see that these people are accurately informed of opportunities for farm work elsewhere.

The effective use in the defense effort of low-income farm families, underemployed because of a lack of resources or of opportunities for employment elsewhere, is an immediate problem. The solution of the low-income farm problem in terms of improved levels of living and practical adjustments of our land and labor resource that will last through war and peace, is the real challenge to agricultural planning and action agencies.

Thine

*Accuse not nature, she hath
done her part. Do thou but
thine.*

THE FINAL *Frontier* —AND WHAT IT MEANS

By JOHN C. PAGE. *The Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, United States Department of the Interior, writes here about the tremendous work of his organization—vast in scope and highly significant in social implications. "Bounteous benefits have already been reaped by the West and the entire Nation," he says. "Those benefits are only a promise of the immense material and human wealth which can be added to the United States by full Reclamation development of Western resources."*



WHEN FARM soil peters out to barrenness, or droughts come and dust-storms blow, or any other cause drives men off farms and out of their jobs and homes, the typical America family packs up its belongings, jumps into a jalopy, and heads West.

Western population has increased three hundredfold since 1900. Our original American pioneers long ago reached the Pacific but still we move westward. There is no reason to expect a change. A habit once acquired is hard to break. For two centuries or more our ancestors have taken to horse and prairie schooner in search of better fields toward the setting sun. Up until a few decades ago they have always found them, and in time the finding became an accepted fact. That the West was a land of opportunity became a national credo, epitomized in remarks such as Horace Greeley's "Go West, young man."

How today's "pioneers" will suc-

ceed in their westward trek is a matter of national concern. And still greater concern may be felt about tomorrow's jobless and landless—the draftees, the munitions workers. What will they do when this abnormal defense employment ends? Nowhere in the West today is there the goal sought in the past: A few hundred acres of fertile soil, a limpid stream, and the material and a site for a log-cabin home—*free*.

Fifty years ago our leaders in the United States Congress came face to face with that hard fact. The American forest primeval and the free West were gone, forever.

Still harder to face was the knowledge that the exhaustion of free land left sprawling across the continent hundreds of millions of empty, unproductive acres of land, while Americans still pushed eagerly westward in search of a better living.

Could some means be found to use this land, to develop this vast territory, half of which was public domain, and provide new opportunities

for these people? The Congress believed so, and tried. Various laws were passed in the trial-and-error endeavor to encourage the settlement of the West.

Water

Most of the error could have been avoided had more heed been paid to the report in 1878 by Maj. John W. Powell of the Geological Survey. His findings indicated clearly that the determining factor in the agricultural development of the arid West, and necessarily all other Western development, was not the land nor the quality of soil so much as its accessibility to an adequate and dependable water supply. In other words, in the arid and semiarid West the important factor was the water. The streams of the West rather than its land would decide when and how much of it could be developed.

On this truth, and under this basis, the Bureau of Reclamation started its work in the West, in 1902. Awaiting American engineering ingenuity and enterprise ran rivers and creeks with enough water for the irrigation of 40 to 50 million acres of good earth. This land could be transformed from desert waste into productive usefulness. It was America's final frontier.

Previous to the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902, creating a Federal irrigation agency, all attempts to encourage proper settlement of the public domain and the development of the West had missed the mark. The Homestead Act of 1862, the Desert Land Act of 1877, and the Carey Act of 1894 all proved inadequate. They failed to solve the problem of converting the vast public domain

into an inhabited, contributing member of the national economy.

Federal Reclamation has succeeded. It has been tried and has been proved. The results of 39 years of construction and settlement in the arid and semiarid regions of the West have demonstrated its worth. Bounteous benefits have already been reaped by the West and the entire Nation. Those benefits are only a promise of the immense material and human wealth which can be added to the United States by full Reclamation development of Western resources.

The elbow room of America lies in the conservation of those resources—the land and water, soil and stream. In the forefront of that conservation is the Bureau of Reclamation. The works of Reclamation catch, store, and make available for multiple use the precious water of the arid West. Reclamation is the final frontier of America.

The conservation and development of Western resources by the storage and beneficial use of water offer us the last opportunity for sound expansion. By the husbanding of the natural wealth of water and soil within our boundaries, the desert wastes of the West can be transformed into homes and a means of self-support for our citizens. Streams now destructive, and water now wasted can create flourishing farms, can generate inexhaustible electric power, and can provide domestic and industrial water supplies. Empty, unproductive areas can be the sites of cities with their business and industry. A great taxable wealth of real and intangible property can be created, and a large dependable market for the

NS
of
rites
in
cous
tire
the
l to
tern

mat-
still
ut to-
—the
kers.
onor-
nds?
here
few
mpid
site

a the
ce to
The
the

now-
land
inent
, un-
while
west-
g.
o use
terri-
c do-
nities

manufactured and processed goods of the rest of the Country.

The work of Reclamation, unfortunately, is not generally understood throughout the East, which is a rainfall area where natural precipitation is adequate for the growth of plants.

Positive Action

About one-third of the West—more than 700,000,000 acres—is arid or semiarid. Practically all of the public domain—about one-half of this vast area—is arid or semiarid. Precipitation over this region is 20 inches or less. Most of this sparse precipitation is unseasonal. Without irrigation, no cultivated agriculture, and no community development are safe. That is why Reclamation's reservoirs are essential to the development of the West.

A review of western expansion shows that Federal Reclamation has been a planned creative step toward the development of this half of the country, and not a remedial corrective measure to repair the damage of overgrazing, erosion, and wrong-type farming. It is a positive rather than a negative action. It was bound to bring results.

In fewer than 4 decades the Bureau of Reclamation has placed storage works in operation which have a capacity of 60,000,000 acre-feet of water, the most precious commodity in the arid West.

These works have been built to serve more than 4,000,000 acres of land, of which 2,500,000 acres were formerly unproductive desert and 1,500,000 acres were in non-Federal irrigation districts with an inadequate water supply.

The Bureau has built 181 storage and diversion dams, more than 20,

000 miles of canals, ditches, and drains, 28 hydroelectric power plants and 100,000 other structures during 39 years of this beneficial work.

As a result, water, power, and light have been brought to Western areas with a population of 4,500,000. On the Reclamation projects in the West there are more than 900,000 farmers and townspeople who make their homes and living out of irrigated land. There are nearly 1,000 schools, more than 1,200 churches, and more than 100 banks with deposits totaling over \$200,000,000.

The irrigation farmers on the projects produce more than \$100,000,000 worth of crops annually; the cumulative value of this contribution to the national wealth in the past 35 years has reached the staggering figure of \$2,750,000,000.

Benefits

The farmers and their town neighbors consistently provide a market for American business and industry worth \$250,000,000 a year—the equivalent almost of our finest foreign markets in normal times.

These results are the returns from a loan of less than \$300,000,000. This loan, without interest out of consideration for the Nation-wide benefits of Reclamation, was the cost of constructing these projects. The loan is being repaid; more than \$60,000,000 has been returned to the Treasury. The return on installment payments due the Government is 97 percent up to date.

The social and economic enrichment which has been created through Reclamation policy means gain for the entire country. The diversified agriculture of the irrigated sections

of the West complements that of the rainfall areas. For example, the livestock industry, the major occupation of the West, depends on irrigated farms for half the forage consumed by the stock. Western irrigated States provide the feeder stock for the fattening pens of the Midwestern farmer who in turn ships his cattle and sheep to Eastern industrial centers.

What would the price of meat, of our steaks and chops and roasts be in the East without this mainstay of the Western livestock industry? The same question, too, could be asked about fresh fruits and vegetables, especially winter vegetables, the specialty of Southwestern Reclamation projects.

General farming, forage crops, and specialties which can be shipped to distant markets for a cash return to buy manufactured and processed goods in exchange characterize the occupation of the average irrigation farmer.

The large staple surplus crops of rainfall regions are not grown in any appreciable quantity on irrigated land. The wheat and corn produced on Reclamation projects are insufficient for immediate local consumption. The cotton grown on Southwestern Reclamation projects is largely long staple, a valuable addition to our national self-sufficiency which requires this commodity in the automobile industry and other manufacturing. Tobacco, the country's fourth major surplus crop, is not grown at all on irrigated farms.

Every Reclamation project has its specialty crop, ranging from cantaloupes and winter lettuce in southern California and citrus fruit and sugar beet seed in Arizona to grapes, olives,

and almonds in northern California, peaches and apples in Washington, clover seed and potatoes in Idaho, cherries in Montana, and sugar beets in Colorado.

Even when they are similar to Eastern crops—and not, for example, a crop like flax, which is steadily assuming more importance on irrigated land—these specialty crops complement rather than compete with those grown by farmers near the large Midwestern and Eastern centers.

Crops

Freight costs prevent most of them from competing in season; they are sold out of season. Because of this continued supply, available at a reasonable cost throughout the season, the public taste for such fruits has been cultivated to a point where former food luxuries are regarded as common necessities for the health and strength of the average American citizen—and increased the demand.

Next to alfalfa and other forage crops, winter truck is the most important irrigation crop. On many Reclamation projects the climate is very mild, especially in the deep Southwest with its 12-month growing season. American housewives who buy fresh green vegetables and fruits in the dead of winter at reasonable prices can thank Reclamation projects for many of them.

Aside from general conditions affecting all farmers, certain factors work to the advantage of the irrigation farmer and certain others work against him. In the first place he is not ordinarily at the complete mercy of fickle weather; this is his strong advantage. However, he

must perform extra work in getting water to his land, he must pay for the construction charge against his land, and for his water. Here he is at a disadvantage.

Offsetting these handicaps are the irrigation farmer's control over the water supply and the ability to farm more intensively and completely a selected piece of good land. These advantages help the irrigation farmer to gross a return per acre two and a half times the national average. But because he buys his water and pays other expenses, which add from \$2.00 to \$5.00 per acre per year to his operating cost, the irrigation farmer's net return is comparable with that of other farmers.

The work of irrigation farming is far more specialized than farming in rainfall areas. The irrigation farmer must have an additional skill.

Irrigation

He must be a good irrigator, which he must learn by study and experience. Proper irrigation is not simple. The problem is to get enough water—not too much, not too little—evenly spread upon the land at the right time to do the most good.

The irrigation problem is different for different soils and for different crops. The irrigation farmer must learn to master his particular problem, and he must pay for his mistakes in learning the art. In some areas farmers are leaching their soil by overirrigation, or even waterlogging their neighbor's farm. Irrigation education is greatly needed in the West.

Today as a result of private, cooperative, State, and Federal efforts, about 20,000,000 acres are under irri-

gation in the West. About 20 percent of this total receives a water supply from Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs. The economic destinies of 15,000,000 people—one out of every ten Americans—depend on these irrigated areas and the towns and cities which have sprung up on irrigation developments or nearby them. Los Angeles, Phoenix, Salt Lake City, Denver, and other great cities have their roots sunk deep in irrigation water. These projects and their cities are the piers on which this Nation bridges the continent.

Construction of irrigation systems began in the middle of the last century. The white pioneers took up where the Indians and Spaniards left off. At the close of the century it became obvious that the development and growth of the West, which had gone forward hand in hand with the development of irrigation, would cease unless the Government came to its rescue.

Federal Participation

The reason for Federal participation was double. First, to continue this beneficial settlement and progress of the West, thus developing the entire country. Second, the remaining water resources required complicated and costly engineering construction that only the Government and experts could finance and build. The easy diversions were exhausted.

As a result, the Bureau of Reclamation, which was made responsible for the continuation of permanent western settlement by the construction of irrigation works, soon assumed the chief role in irrigation development. For the past 15 years it has been practically the only im-

portant agency engaged in building irrigation systems.

Besides its work of building new irrigation projects, the Bureau has also had to assume the task of rescuing non-Federal projects and their populations from stagnation and decay. Many non-Federal enterprises have been built overoptimistically without proper investigation and without adequate water supplies. The Bureau has furnished a number of irrigation enterprises with a supplementary supply of water by building new and larger systems.

This work forms an important segment of future irrigation construction by the Bureau. Its limit, and that for new land, will be determined by the amount of unused water available in western streams. This has been estimated at enough for 22,000,000 acres, which would set the ceiling of irrigated land in the United States at about 40,000,000 acres, about 10 percent of the public domain.

The work of providing a supplementary supply of water is particularly significant in that it helps stabilize and bolster hardpressed irrigated areas short of water. Experience with the last depression showed that tax delinquencies on certain irrigated lands amounted to only a little over 5 percent as heavy as those on adjacent nonirrigated farming land. The difference was solely due to the stabilizing influence of irrigation.

Stability

Irrigation lends a stability without which the very governmental structure of the West could not exist. Nor is this benefit confined to the West. Irrigation farmers buy processed food, farm machinery, and

other manufactured goods produced by factories in the Midwest and East. The business created by these purchases steadies the industrial economy of those areas. It enables the factory workman to buy his necessities, including the produce of local farms.

A survey at the Boise Reclamation project in Idaho showed that incoming shipments came by rail from 30 non-Western States. From Michigan came automobiles, cereals, electrical goods, and furniture; from Pennsylvania came lubricating oil, groceries, steel, and steel products; from Ohio came agricultural implements, and farm supplies, refrigerators and other household equipment; from New York came food-stuffs and building materials; from the Southern States came lumber—and so on down the list.

The stabilization of irrigation projects extends to more than pay rolls; it reaches our people. In the past decade more than a million men, women, and children migrated to the Far Western States and Idaho. The great majority came from the agricultural areas east of the Rocky Mountains, chiefly from the Great Plains.

Drought, mechanization, and submarginal soil had driven them off their farms in search of other livelihood. They swelled the burden of relief in these irrigation States to nearly a billion dollars over a period of 6 years.

There has never been mass migration from Reclamation projects. The comparatively stable and growing population of these projects suffers chiefly from mass immigration—from migrants searching for jobs and security. With enough irrigation land available, opportunities

per-
ter-
ion
ties
of
on
owns
on
arby
Salt
reat
ects
on
the
ems
cen-
up
left
ry it
ment
had
the
ould
ame

ci-
pina-
in-
pro-
g-
the
main-
mpli-
con-
ment
build-
sted.
ecla-
visi-
per-
ent
struc-
on as-
ation
years
im-

could be provided for thousands of these migrants. Under favorable farming conditions and with adequate assistance, most farm refugees can become self-supporting.

Federal Reclamation has never been an emergency program but the Bureau has been fortunate enough to complete facilities in the past 10 years which have provided a water supply for more than 300,000 acres in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming. This land together with 300,000 irrigated acres given a supplementary supply of water has created or preserved a means of self-support for 15,000 families.

The present program of the Bureau includes more than making these opportunities for a home and livelihood; it will stabilize disturbed areas in the twilight migration belt, and anchor potential migrants, by steadyng the agricultural life of the region with a dependable water supply.

The water conservation and utilization projects of the Bureau are especially designed toward this goal. While relatively small, these projects

can exert a profound influence on surrounding regions. One irrigated acre will generally stabilize the agricultural economy of 3 to 4 other acres of farmland, but in the range country it has been the experience that a single acre under irrigation will bolster fully 30 others not under irrigation.

Twelve water conservation and utilization projects have been approved for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation. Investigations are in progress on 35 more. The National Resources Planning Board, the Department of Agriculture, the Work Projects Administration, and the Civilian Conservation Corps are participants in this valuable new aspect of Reclamation.

This aspect symbolizes the true objective of Reclamation. The great dams, canals, and irrigation systems built by the Bureau in the West, the tremendous pumping and power plants, and the extensive transmission systems are but means to the end—the development of the natural and human resources of the Nation, with more prosperous livelihoods and a better standard of living.

In the past too many people in our country have been ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed. And even though the number has decreased as our national defense program has gone forward, we still have too many who lack the opportunity to become self-sufficient. Working out a more permanent answer to this key social and economic problem is a challenge that must not go unheard despite the war trumpets. The future isn't in the habit of taking care of itself.

—ROY F. HENDRICKSON

Nonstatistical NOTES FROM THE FIELD

By PAUL S. TAYLOR. *A noted economist sets down—with the truth of poetry—his observations in the Middle West. He is not interested in averages, he says; he is interested in people.*



MY METHOD in the field is to observe, then to select. But some of my statistician friends demand numbers. When I tell them in detail what happened to a farm family I saw displaced in the Cotton Belt, they are likely to say, "What's that to us if you can't tell how many that has happened to?"

Perhaps I can't, and I answer, "By the time you statisticians know the numbers, what I'm trying to tell you in advance about will be history, and you'll be too late."

My statistician friends tell me gently that "observations are notoriously unreliable." Well, I say, that depends upon how well they are made, and what's behind them, and what's done with them—like figures on the value of products sold, traded, or used, or the number of farms on a cotton plantation. My statistician friends seem to love averages, and to be dissatisfied with my description if it doesn't strike them as "average" for the county, State, or perhaps the Nation; if it isn't average it isn't typical, and it's only the typical that counts.

Average of what? I ask myself. Typical of what? Aren't there many averages and many types: And if the average reveals, doesn't it by the same token conceal? Be-

sides, maybe I'm not interested for the moment in averages. Maybe I'm looking for trends, and don't want to cancel out the very item where I think I see the "future" foreshadowed by "history," by averaging it with another where the "future" has not yet struck.

One of my statistician friends tells me that if I want to reveal what farm houses or farm laborers are like, I must describe or photograph as they come, say, every fifth and tenth house or laborer. In that procedure, he says, he would have more confidence than in what I do. Can he be as right as he is logical? I think no curator of a museum would choose his specimens that way.

Except that these thoughts seem to cross the minds of some of my friends—sometimes they tell me—I wouldn't bring them up as introduction to a few notes from recent field work of Dorothea Lange and mine in the Middle West. The argument seems about as fruitful as those consuming and endless debates over induction versus deduction, heredity versus environment, theory versus practice, but no more so. Anyway, I do not feel that I have been misled. The results I get from observation stimulate my own thoughts more than many columns of figures; they

have opened issues of significance; they fortify me in one of the ways of work that I like most. I have nothing against statistics.

Nothing for Them

"It's a man's own fault if he goes broke—in America. He don't need to go broke if he uses his head for more than a hatrack. I started as a renter of 140 acres. Now I operate five farms. I hire six men during harvest, and have two big tractors, and run 1,620 acres." Our car, with its "foreign" license, was standing in the middle of a deserted block-and-a-half-long main street of western Nebraska. We paused to face the dead fronts of the Bonanza Hotel, the Largest Dance Hall in the county, and the Angora State Bank. Obviously strangers shocked by the desolation, we needed to be put straight. So the big-shouldered, energetic farmer who walked by undertook to do it.

He continued: "When the drought was worst we got 6 or 7 bushels to the acre and wondered if it was worth combining. This year we'll get 30 bushels of wheat. I made money all through—they've got the triple A, you know. Now I own the beer parlor, and all these town buildings for wheat store-houses."

As I passed the open door of the bank the voice of an old man, lying slumped in his clothing on an iron bed, called me to enter. All was junk and confusion within, but the solid square construction and iron vault confirmed the faded sign over the door. The old man was father of the farmer. He'd paid \$500 for the building when the bank failed. He "came to that country when it was new, from Aberdeen, South Da-

kota, with \$33,000." In 1919 he "paid income tax on \$960 a month." One year he "went to the Holy Land with Aimee Semple McPherson and heard the Gospel twice a day." Gave his wife \$54,000, but now she and the money were both gone.

Pointing south to a sturdy farmhouse surrounded by wheat, he went on: "Last year I bought that 80 and that house 36 by 36 with full basement, for \$1,000 paid in hand. Now see that wheat! A third of them shocks are mine."

On the hill above town stood a white church, closed, wheat up to the door. "Where are the members?" we asked. "They all dried out." Everywhere wheat, and the signs of emptiness of people. The gas station man said, "Now they're hellin' around here for labor to harvest the wheat. Nine combines came by here today; 120 went through here last season. They travel on rubber from Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, and work to North Dakota and Montana."

Will the farmers and the townsmen who left come back now that there's wheat and rain? "No," the energetic farmer said, "they're not well-enough fixed to come back. There's nothing for them."

Rosebud

Before 1909 the southern tier of counties west of the Missouri in central South Dakota was covered with grass. Sheep and cattle grazed upon it. It was known as the Rosebud Indian Reservation. Beginning in 1909, blocks of it were opened to homesteaders in a series of land lotteries. I remember as a boy hearing people consider whether to keep their job in the city or to take up a homestead on the plains. I remem-

ber the talk when trainloads of land-seekers went through Sioux City bound for the Rosebud when word came to the winners of the drawings, when trips were made to see the lands that were won, to decide finally whether or not to homestead the claim.

"Maladministration of the homestead laws," says a governmental report, "which was encouraged by predatory interests led to the settlement of areas admittedly submarginal for farming purposes. During the war almost all the available land was broken for wheat, and excellent crops were raised when rainfall was normal and no pests appeared."

A generation after settlement, in the summer of 1941, came my first look at this Rosebud country. Almost the first sight after crossing the border from Nebraska was a vacant farmstead. A few miles farther brought us to an "inland town," a county seat. No rail or bus, a dozen telephones, few baths, and mostly outside toilets. But a cleaner, trimmer town than you imagine, and the people certainly are not shiftless. Between 1930 and 1940 the county lost one-third of its farmers.

"We've lost a lot of good men. They got discouraged and sold out. The State rural credit got the farms, sold the improvements off the place, leased the land to the big operators. The triple A wheat benefit goes with the land; they ought to limit the farmer's benefit to his own 10-year average.

"Half the businessmen in town are farmers. If a man's in one kind of business, it seems like he shouldn't go into competition with the man on the farm trying to make a living from it. But if it weren't for the

triple A benefits there just wouldn't be a town here at all."

When you're in the field, don't expect people to agree on the triple A or on anything else. When they don't, maybe one of them is wrong. More often each is giving you another side of truth, which has many. Accounts seldom divide simply into the true and the false.

Twenty miles east we talked with a crossroads merchant in a little town where many people left and went to Oregon.

Not all the people left, of course. Farmers' families are fewer, and it's tough on crossroads storekeepers. But the county seat in this belt of depopulation still grows. We had seen the same thing in northwestern Texas cotton counties during 1937. The census says this town grew from 720 population in 1930 to 1,013 in 1940. Farmers are the pawns of the game; they are moved about by greater forces. After years of drought and grasshoppers, they can't pay taxes.

"The land goes to the county and the county sells the houses cheap. The postmaster or anybody with money to invest buys the houses and moves them to town." Around the fringes of the county seat are 20 or more houses with sheet metal over the chimney hole in the roof, with new foundations, or with other fresh signs that they've been moved.

It's the same in the next county seat to the east: The people leave the farms to certify on WPA in the towns; the houses follow the people, hauled in, set down, stuccoed up, and rented out to them. Seventy of these was the count by local residents given to us in a town which reported 457 people to the census of 1940.

And in the next county seat beyond they say the number of farm houses moved in is about 50. You can see them easily, out around the edges. They are the outward mark of what a rural sociologist labels in professional jargon, "social-economic submergence in a Plains State."

Maybe the housing shortage is worse because some people lacked foresight.

"A lot of people tore down the improvements on their farms to save taxes, and now wish they hadn't." Those houses could have earned rentals in town, or they could have stored free of charge the wheat crop of 1941.

Tombstones

Out in the country there are still empty staring windows to mark where farmers lived. There still are empty barns, silent windmills, and yards strewn with rusting iron and filled with overgrown weeds. Will the farmers ever return? It is more likely that these buildings are tombstones.

Nine miles east of Winner at a cross road we pulled up short. In my brief case was an early report mimeographed by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. On maps of 1935 the township where our car stood was shaded to denote "severe devastation" by "grasshopper infestation," "severe erosion" by wind, and was marked 52 percent of the farms already "abandoned." A photograph showed "grove and buildings covered by drifting soil," with those undulations and ripples on swollen soil banks so familiar from the pictures of dust bowls.

Now, 6 years later, we are standing on this same spot. Gleaming

stubble of wheat rings closely what was the home acre. Underneath a cover of tickle-weed is the soft and swelling line of soil drifts that choked to death the trees of the windbreak. Weeds and mounds mark the foundations of buildings. A lone tree in leaf shows perhaps where the well was put down—a sprig of life on the grave of defeat of a farm family.

But this year the plains are covered with wheat. Out in the country the combines are running. Laundry hangs from the lines to mark those farmhouses where men and women have stuck it out. For some it is still tough. A farmer crosses the fence to our car, places his foot on the running board and says he's not finished yet, but he's "lived here 25 years too long."

For others who have taken over the lands of those who are gone, 1941 is a year of big rewards. A sweating man in trousers and under-shirt drives up to a service station, fills up, and drives away. "That man," says our host, "is running a combine night and day. This year he will clear \$7,000."

"Science and invention," a local agricultural official explains, "is what makes it possible for a man owning 320 acres to run a 3,000-acre farm."

Thoughtfully in 1935 the supervisor of rural research in South Dakota for the Federal Emergency Relief Administration wrote these words: " * * * a return of favorable climatic conditions will unquestionably result in a new influx of farmers who will probably go through the same history as the earlier group. To prevent this, it is necessary that some measure of control be exercised over resettlement to

provide intelligence for a rational depopulation of the county."

Framed as a question, the same thought was in our minds as we drove through the Rosebud 6 years later. Was this depopulation "rational"?

A homesteader gave us his perspective: "30 years ago the people got land for 75 cents and \$1.25 an acre for homesteading. Now a man without money has no chance here. The big cattlemen and big wheat men got it sewed up."

Toward dusk that day we came upon a family in an old car with an Oklahoma license. The man had just shot a rabbit for supper, and was cleaning his rifle barrel. Yes, they work as migrants in the fields of California. Now they labor in the wheat harvest across the Dakotas.

We did not ask, but the answer was in our minds: Yes, they'll be back in California, and in the cotton from Corpus Christi to Phoenix, and in the strawberries from east of Portland to north of Little Rock, and in the apple orchards of Yakima and north of Ogden, and in the potatoes near Kearney, and back in Oklahoma with the folks, and again next year in the wheat of the Dakotas where so many farmers have left.

Agricultural Ladder

Northwest of Des Moines for 150 miles and more the barns are big, the barnyards trim, the houses four-square, the farmsteads bordered by trees. We pulled into one of these yards opposite a great red barn, with the owner's name and Plainview Farm lettered in white paint across its face. The farmer was broad,

stocky, overalled, heavy-armed—the kind I had known as a boy, the kind made known the country over by Ding's cartoons of the Iowa Farmer.

His story was success. He was the farm success legend of the Middle Border in the flesh. I grew up surrounded by the legend of which he is the epitome. That legend has enveloped the Mississippi Valley and permeated the minds of our best thinkers about our national agriculture. I say this without disparagement, for great values are embedded in the legend. But still it is a legend, part fact, part fancy, revealing with fidelity the strivings, ideals, and character of a people. This was the first good look I'd had at it since I was a boy, returning after long observation of industrialized farming in the West and some good looks at tenants and plantations in the South.

Hired man, 1901: "In 1901, my uncle hired me out to a farmer at \$160 a year and board. I saved \$100. I was 17 years old, and an orphan. I hired out 12 years, by the month, and made extra money threshing. The main object is the saving. I had saved \$4,000 by 1913 when I got married. That year I bought equipment and farmed 160 acres on shares, two-fifths of the grain to the landlord and two-fifths of the corn. When I got off the rented place in 1918, I had \$18,000 cash. With that I bought 80 acres at \$225 an acre, and then another 80 acres at \$150. In 1937 I bought 40 acres for \$100 an acre, making 200 acres.

"At one time—1919 it was—I was offered \$500 an acre for my 160. If I had taken it, I would have bought some more land at high prices and then lost it all in the depression. So many here have done that. Now

they're on relief, on the county. Many of them were well-to-do. Four families owned this farm before us. Not anyone who had it has anything now."

Hired man, 1941: The Plainview Farmer continued: "My hired man's father owned a farm near here, also 200 acres. He had 10 children. He said, 'We'll get more land for the children.' So he bought another section and mortgaged both farms to pay for it and lost both. The children are now working as hired help and WPA, all but one who is a renter.

"I pay my hired man \$50 a month now. I give him a house, milk, eggs, garden, and electricity—and he's hard up, just as hard up one Saturday night as the next. His wife says they 'live only once and they're going to town a couple of nights a week if they want to. If the banks are going to go that way, we're going to spend the money before the banks go. Look at his Dad. He worked hard and saved and owned 200 acres. See how he came out. We'll work hard till we're 65 and then live on a pension.'"

Turning tide: The successful hired man of 1901 was perplexed that his own hired man of 1941 failed to recognize that "the main object is the saving." But he had no ready answer. He was disturbed too, by the lowered value of character as a business asset, and bothered by the doubtful social morality of consolidating land to make farms larger, which seems only in line with ideals long accepted, and with the sound economics of getting ahead.

"You couldn't find another man in the county that has followed in my footsteps," he went on. "You can't

do it now without you got some backing. You can't get the credit; they used to place some value on a man's word. Now it seems they don't. Yes, it's profitable for a man to farm more land than we do; I'm buying another 80. It's the best place I know to put my money. But it's not so good for the country. It puts the other fellow out; he'll go and live on Uncle Sam."

Iowa

About 1855, a German Protestant sect, the Community of True Inspiration, bought 26,000 acres of good land in eastern Iowa. The grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and even a few of the children are there today. Their forefathers pooled their goods when they went to the frontier before the Civil War and founded the seven villages of Amana. Their religion didn't command that, like early Christmas, they should have all things in common, but it permitted it. At the time, it seemed to them the only way to ensure that their group would survive. The 26,000-acre farm was run as a unit, the Society owned everything, no wages were paid, only small book credits at the Society commissary. In time small factories were set up to balance agriculture and to employ the growing number of hands.

After three-quarters of a century, the people of Amana voted a change in 1932. Change, they realized at last, was necessary, inevitable. So they voted out communism in the form they had known it. No violent revolution, no throwing overboard old faiths, no jettisoning of the aged and the dissenters, no breach of the deep and pervading calm. Deliberately they chose private property in houses, and wages.

ome
dit;
n a
hey
nan
I'm
est
But
It
go
ant
In
of
The
ren,
are
ers
ent
Var
of
com
hey
on,
, it
en-
ive.
s a
ng,
ook
ary.
up
loy
ury,
nge
at
So
the
vio-
ver-
of
no
ing
pri-
ges.

Private kitchens in every home, and no work no eat. The 26,000-acre farm still belongs to the Society of which all are members, and is still run as a unit. The wollen blanket mill, the refrigerator factory, the meat markets, stores, gas stations, and cabinet shop belong to the Society. But the members now work for wages. Modified capitalism they call it—cooperative.

The Society is very much alive today. I came upon one of the villages on U. S. 6—a charming French village pattern, inhabited by innately cultured and friendly German-Americans set down in the sea of isolated farmsteads and individualistic farmers that is the Middle West. It's something out of a past strange to most of us. Its history is in the books but the Society isn't embalmed between covers. It harks back to century-old dreams of Utopians, yet it was not built by idealists reforming the world. It was founded by realists seeking only survival. It is their success that today life pulses strongly through Amana.

What's the meaning of the great change of 1932? I asked a middle-aged man waiting for his meat at the butcher shop, how is it different now? His eyes began to twinkle and he spoke slowly, "Well, now the hay-fever bucks work on the straw pile in the middle of the season."

Practical enough, I thought, for my own experience gave me comprehension, but I wanted to know more.

So I went on, "You didn't use to have poverty, did you?"

"Well, each one of us had as much as the others."

I pressed the question: "Now that you have private property, and wages only if you work, have you

poverty, too, like we have outside?"

"No," he said with understanding, and another twinkle, "no, but I think I can see signs of it coming."

At the moment I couldn't think what to ask him next, so I left. But his replies have been pulling at me ever since to go back and find out more.

On a Campus

Up the broad walk came one of my own profession, a man justly recognized for a lifetime of work in his specialty. We paused and spoke.

"I, too," he said, "am writing. I am writing a history of agriculture."

"Perhaps I can suggest a source or two that might aid you?" I volunteered, naming a good but little known piece of research in local history of agricultural labor.

"Oh, but I'm writing the history of just agriculture," he explained.

"Yes?" I replied, "I've always held the hope that I could raise in men's minds the question, are farm laborers a part of agriculture?"

"Oh, certainly they are part of agriculture," he said, ready to agree, "just as much a part of agriculture as—teams."

"Now you've proved the point of my question to the hilt," I said; "I shall use this story to help others to see the point."

"Don't get me wrong," he warned, "don't say I said that laborers were animals."

"No," I replied, "I know you didn't, and I know that you are a very humane man. I shall not quote you wrong."

I started to go my way and he half-turned to go his.

"Sometime," he said thoughtfully, as we parted, "I'd like to talk more about this."

Let Us Have Faith IN DEMOCRACY

*By ELEANOR ROOSEVELT. The most important task * * * is the awakening of every citizen to a real awareness of his own community. Through that awakening will come the sense of responsibility that is essential to make democracy function all the time.*



ONE DAY as I entered the village post-office at Hyde Park, I noticed that a representative of the Forest Service had an office there. I wondered what work the Forest Service was doing in Dutchess County; and for the first time, I asked about it.

It occurred to me that perhaps this work was too concentrated on one particular thing; that many more things needed to be done. Then I inquired whether other representatives of the Department of Agriculture were doing some of the tasks that suddenly seemed to me to be so important; and I discovered a great number of worthwhile things being done in my own county which I had never known before.

This experience made me realize that we Americans have not yet scratched the surface in understanding what activities are being carried on and what services are available in our communities. And unless we do know what is being done in our own communities, either by Government services or by other organizations, it is impossible for us to function at our best as active citizens in a democracy.

Out of all the organizations and services available in our home communities, most of us have a clear impression of only the one or two with which we have the most direct and frequent contact.

In every locality, citizens should get together and talk over the life of their community and all the governmental functions that touch it—the needs and the ideas behind each program. Of course, no one can spread himself so much that he takes part in every community activity, and still make an effective contribution, but very often he can make a better contribution to one activity if he sees the over-all picture.

A democratic form of government, a democratic way of life, presupposes free public education over a long period; it presupposes also an education for personal responsibility that too often is neglected.

The most important task in the development of a workable philosophy to insure the success of democracy is the awakening of every citizen to a real awareness of his own community. Through that awakening will come the sense of responsibility that is essential to

make democracy function all the time. It functions now in spurts. Often it is totally unconscious of events in government or even of trends in thinking, as the people define the way of life they wish to lead.

Time and again a man or woman will say, "My representatives in Congress or the State Legislature are such poor representatives; they never seem to understand what I really think they should do."

And then, instead of feeling a personal responsibility for those representatives, the same people will vote for them again at the election, or fail to vote at all. The reason a certain number of people have been willing to accept dictatorship is that they were unwilling to think for themselves and to take the responsibility that is ours if we accept the philosophy of a democratic form of government.

Freedom to Think

Our greatest safeguard is the constant exercise of the right of the people to express their changing opinion at the polls and the acceptance by all people of the majority decision so expressed—until it is again altered at the polls. The only alternative is a constant use of force, with the physically strongest group gaining the upper hand.

An individual may not like the decision of the majority, but if he overthrows it he has destroyed his own right to change his mind. The thing that really preserves freedom is the liberty of every individual to express his thinking of the moment; and, since thinking can change, individuals in the minority need never feel they are not being fairly treated.

They have every opportunity through education to change that minority into a majority.

Democracy cannot be static. Whatever is static is dead. Democracy cannot be frozen into words that will remain the same today, tomorrow, and forever. Our conception of the government we want and the way of life we want must be set by what we think today. However, if we think of democracy as a method by which people can express their changing opinions at regular intervals, then it is a workable philosophy of human relations in a complex world. The fact that each individual lives under the decision of a majority is fundamental in the democratic functioning of any government.

Sometimes people become too impatient. They want to see effected the things they believe should happen even before they have gone through the democratic process of convincing people through persuasion and education. To those who think certain ideas should hold sway, it often seems that the democratic process is pretty slow. But we must be willing to recognize the fact that the democratic process depends upon the ability of the people to understand and accept certain beliefs, and to make themselves conform to those beliefs.

It is one thing to believe in a theory and quite another to be willing actually to put that theory into practice. That is one of the things that make people wonder sometimes whether democracy can actually work in the world as it is today. It requires an educated people. It requires a people who can read—who can inform themselves; a people really able to listen to arguments

and sufficiently open-minded to weigh those arguments.

Only in a democracy do individuals actually have the opportunity to help decide the policies of their State and Nation. Nowhere else does the individual have to shoulder so great a responsibility as under democratic government.

We in the United States have the greatest opportunity in the world today for developing in our citizens a realization of what democracy can mean. If it means what it should to this Country, it will mean something to the rest of the world.

Of course, no one can say that everyone in this Country has a feeling of responsibility for the government and of understanding for its many functions. Nor would everyone be able to participate in the real functions of government, if he or she had that feeling. But our citizens come closer to this ideal than those of any other nation.

Recently a friend remarked, "I would not dream of undertaking this job if it wasn't that the emergency is so great, but I think by working in all the hours I have used for leisure, I'll be able to do the two jobs."

That is the sort of thing a person does only under the pressure of the

feeling that his convictions are at stake and that he owes it to his future stability to work hard for the things he believes in.

If we all share that feeling, if we do our best to develop our responsibility as citizens and as individuals, we will come through this difficult period with a better Nation, and a valuable contribution to the rest of the world.

We can be certain there will be enormous material demands upon us because of all the material things now being destroyed. We will have just as great demands on our spiritual and mental capacities. We will be asked to draw on all our imagination, all our knowledge of history, to understand the plight of the people in devastated countries. We will be asked to have faith, and to transmit it to people who have lost faith.

Only if we ourselves have faith in the fundamental decency and unselfishness of mankind, can we restore it to the rest of the world. And only if the world regains that faith, can it hope to rebuild friendship between men, hope to avoid future conflagration, and hope to make it possible for democracy to flourish in all lands.

Given the national will to do it, we have the power to build here in America a nation of people more fit, more vigorous, more competent, a nation with better morale, a more united purpose, more toughness of body, and greater strength of mind than the world has ever seen.

—THOMAS PARRAN

When a Farmer PLANS FOR THE WAR

By R. S. KIFER. Farmers everywhere are making plans for helping, in their way, to win the war, and the advice is here given: "The effectiveness of agriculture's contribution to the war program can be enhanced by its careful adjustment to local conditions and individual farm plans."



IF YOU know a farming community in which farms are all of a precise size, just large enough for a minimum income, and in which farms are so operated that each is a self-contained economic unit, ask yourself, is it normal? There are such communities.

Probably they have these common characteristics: They are young, immature communities; farms were made that way—they did not develop; some outside restraining force prevents the farms from evolving into the accustomed pattern showing a range in size and the difference in type of farms that one expects to see in a matured, healthy community. Is there a reason why farms should not be planned so that each will have a place in the economic organization of a community?

The individual farm plan has come to have a definite and important place in agricultural programs. These farm plans may chart the course of the entire farm business for the years ahead or they may deal with one adjustment to be made in one cropping season.

They may include the entire range

of factors that go to make up the organization and management problems or they may be limited to one phase, such as a cropping system for the farm. Different objectives then may require differences in procedure.

A few objectives of farm planning are: Conservation of the soil, the achievement for the Nation of a certain level of production, increased income for the farm operator, and the greatest number of farmers consistent with an acceptable level of income.

A plan to reach one objective would not ignore all others, but as the objective may fashion the plan, all of these, and others, are important to a job of realistic planning. The plan may provide for an immediate adjustment in the farm business or it may point to a goal several years ahead, but two essential considerations are the relation of a farm to others in the community and the effect which the changes caused by time will have on the farmer and on his production plan.

One assumption implicit in most farm plans has been that the farm would be a full-time enterprise for a

farmer and his family and that the organization of the farm would be such that the best use would be made of all productive resources. This means that within an individual farm unit an approximate balance between land, labor, and equipment had to be reached.

Some plans were devised for general presentation. They were based on a typical or modal farm, but did not precisely accommodate any one. Usually they assumed an average or standard measure of efficiency and employed normal or standard relations between input and product. Such plans neglected the wide range in individual efficiency because the planner did not expect his plan to be used in all situations. Individual farm peculiarities must be recognized if plans for all farms within an area are being developed.

Realistic

To be effective, the farm plan must be realistic, and if it is to be realized the plan must be derived from situations similar to those in which the farmer finds himself. Individual farm plans starting with two concepts, one a minimum acreage and the other a self-contained unit, depart from this realism if they do not adequately provide for two essentials in the life of a farm community, the economic interplay between farms, and those changes in farm organization and management that accompany the development, maturity, aging, and retirement of the farmer himself.

Despite the effort to plan realistically, individual farm plans, created as they frequently are under a system of mass production, seem to acquire some characteristics that would

fit the plan to a static farmer in a static economy.

True, some assumptions must be made. The procedure usually starts with a given size of farm and, assuming of a certain level of productivity, operation at a given level of managerial ability, a certain level of efficiency in livestock production, and assumed prices, calculates a probable income. Perhaps the procedure starts with a desired income, or a standard of soil conservation, and derives the desired size of farm. In either case, so long as the goal and the means of reaching it are set up for one period, one set of price relations, one condition of technical development, one stage in the life of the farmer, then the plan lacks the flexibility needed to fit the operation of the farm into the national and local economy.

If the plan is the basis for making agricultural adjustments, it must represent the situation, not of the average farmer, but of the wide range of farmers who go to make up the average.

When these plans are used as a basis for guiding programs aimed to achieve certain adjustments in production, the welfare, not only of the farmers themselves, but also of the consumers in the United States, depends upon the accuracy with which the plans are drawn and the degree to which they can be carried out.

The effectiveness of agriculture's contribution to the war program no doubt can be enhanced by its careful adjustment to local conditions and individual farm plans.

Probably the simplest approach is to request uniform adjustments from all producers. Such an approach could be followed in reducing the acreage of crops. Uniform reduc-

tions, although not wholly equitable, are possible, but uniform percentage increases of such products as milk, eggs, and meat may be wholly impracticable. Because a reduction of a given percentage from a given level of production can be made, it does not follow that all farmers can increase by a given percentage from their present level of production without disrupting the organization of their own or other farms.

Some farmers are already turning out as much as can be produced economically, while others could profitably increase production of a particular commodity even without the incentive of Government programs. Because farms within even homogeneous areas differ widely in size and in use of resources, uniform farm plans cannot be applied and requests for uniform increases in production are likely to be disappointing.

Although the wide variation in farming situations is recognized,

there seems to have been always some inducement to standardize farm plans. The drafters of the original Homestead Act must have visualized farms each being 160 acres in size and each supporting a farm family. The history of most of the homesteaded areas is that, as the community matured, farms broke away from the uniform size, and almost all homesteaded areas now have a wide range both in size and type of farm. Farmers had to break through the uniform land pattern before the production possibilities of many areas could be developed.

Farms on the recent agricultural developments follow a limited number of patterns. Selected farm families were placed on farms of the same size, with a standard set of buildings. To a certain extent plans were for similar equipment, similar use of resources, and similar production on all farms.

Such uniform plans introduce a certain amount of rigidity into any farming community. When these rigidities are reinforced with a fixed capital investment, these uniform farm layouts will persist and may possibly retard some desirable individual adjustments necessary for the community to keep pace with economic change.

A normal evolution would in time break through this uniform size and organization, and the consequent picture will show the range in size of farms and methods of operation that characterize a mature community.

Balance

The reasons for this break-down from absolute uniformity should be

Pledge

I am confident that American farmers will acquit themselves gloriously in the dark days ahead. Our own agricultural issues are overshadowed by the issues that face us as a nation, and to meet those issues we must pledge "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

—EDWARD A. O'NEAL

quite evident. Physical differences in soil lead to differences in its productivity. Even if the original productivity were uniform, in the course of years this productivity would differ under the different systems of management, and under the managements of different individuals.

Individuals

New production techniques and changes in economic conditions also promote changes in size and types of farms, and although at the beginning the resources are equal on all farms, the adjustments made differ so that in the end changes in size of farm and methods of operation are to be expected. But even if technical and economic conditions remain the same, one would expect to find in any developed community a range in kinds of farms and sizes of farms, the inevitable consequence of differences in the capacities and the ambitions of individual operators.

Although farm plans are drawn up as if the farms were self-contained units, farms do not often achieve this degree of independence. The economic and persisting type of farm may not be the perfectly balanced one. The dairy farm in the East does not produce all of the feed needed for the production of milk. The reason is obvious. Should a dairy farmer in the Middle West produce all of the feed needed for a given level of dairy production? Personal specialization within an area itself leads to differences in organization, and farms within a community begin to take on supplementary and complementary relations. These relations between farms may be as important or more

important even than the supplementary and complementary relations between enterprises on an individual farm.

Another element to be considered is that in a mature community, and in the United States, most are of this type. Distribution of farms reflects the operations of farmers in all stages of individual development. The type of production followed, the tenure, the investment of capital, and the nature of production are not the same for all farmers. These changes as farmers advance in age and as they acquire capital and experience.

Realistic planning on individual farms would provide for expansion by those farmers who are enlarging operations and increasing their efficiency. Other farmers, having passed the highest point in their personal development, would naturally decrease production in the face of decreasing efficiency.

We have, therefore, a situation in which the modal or standard farm available for use as a sample, or one to illustrate desirable adjustments, is not adequate to reflect the changes which should or will be made within a community.

One cannot expect the sum of all the changes in an area to equal the changes made on a selected farm multiplied by the number of farms within the area, particularly when the example is selected to show what changes can be made.

Labor

A classification of farms for any area shows a range in size of farms and differences in types of farms. This distribution does not reveal the interdependence which may have developed between different farms, but

the range in size and the distribution in type usually is sufficient to indicate that within a locality, farms do have certain working relations, one with the other, and that the most economical production within a farm locality is not gained by a standardized balance between the factors of production or the use of resources of each and every farm.

The situation, known, but not always recognized, in farm planning is that some farms have an excess of labor and that this labor is available to supplement the labor needed on other farms where the labor supply is inadequate. Possibly the excess farm labor is available for industrial work in nearby urban centers.

Moreover, there is always a certain amount of interchange between livestock and feed on different farms. Excess pasture on one farm may be used to grow out young stock for other farmers who depend either on feeding livestock or on milk cows for the major part of their income.

There is no reason then why every farm plan must show a perfect balance between mature animals and replacement of stock. Feed grains

from farms in surplus producing areas are necessary if feed supplies are to be maintained in deficit areas. Even an area which is self-sufficient in feed will show considerable interchange of hay and feed grains between farms, depending upon the particular situations of those individual farmers. In the details of farm operation there is an interchange of equipment through either custom work, hiring, borrowing, or the cooperative use of equipment as a means of getting work done.

A study of the needs of land by individuals indicated that young farmers and old farmers tended to be located upon small units, whereas farmers with experience who had accumulated some capital or who had available family labor were operating the larger and what were considered the more nearly economical farm units. Yet these off-sized types make their contribution to the community welfare and to national output.

Planning should then consider that in any normal community there are a number of farmers who will contribute something to the economy of other farmers; that some farmers are in a position to make marked increases in production; that other farmers would find it inconvenient to make any increases at all, and that a recommended flat rate of increase would probably not result in anything like the desired objective.

A too assiduous pursuit of a typical or an easily visualized situation may lead the researcher and the planner to overlook some very important facts in the interfarm relations which have a marked bearing upon the production of all of our agricultural commodities.

1776

Since 1776 and long before that historic birthday of freedom, the farmer has been in the forefront of every battle for human liberty.

—LOUIS J. TABER

Checking THE LIMITED GRAZING PRACTICE

By CHARLES B. HOWE. *A brief outline is given here of elements involved in checking compliance with the new range programs. An old and thorny problem, this, that must now be solved.*



THE INCLUSION of a limited grazing practice in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration range program for 1942 brings that agency face to face with the practical problem of how to check compliance. The question is not new, but range agencies have found no satisfactory solution because administrative, no less than technical, considerations are involved.

But since the job has to be done, and done within the limitations of the administrative and statutory framework under which AAA must work, it is probable that the first steps will have to be a compromise between technical excellence and administrative practicability. What is finally developed should interest all persons concerned with range management, for it can turn out to be one of the most important large-scale administrative experiments in many a day.

Two quite different approaches might be used to determine when a rancher has carried out the practice of limited grazing. The first is to count the number of head grazed, pasture by pasture—a job that involves considering the duration of

the grazing period and the number of livestock. The alternative is to estimate the degree of use to which the forage crop has been subjected—a procedure commonly known as a "utilization check."

AAA has put both approaches to a preliminary trial. In the Flint Hills of Kansas a livestock count seemed to be the most satisfactory start. On the other hand, in western Nebraska and in Meagher County, Montana, the difficulty of making a livestock count swung the choice to a utilization check, though in each area the detailed procedures followed were quite different.

Local methods of handling livestock largely determine the least expensive method, and the one least objectionable to ranchers, considerations to remember in operating a big action program.

And so of considerable administrative significance is the question: Will the two approaches—the livestock-count and the utilization check—yield the same kind of answer? Moreover, in the 13 Western States, where an earnest attempt has been made to establish ranch grazing capacities following the standard range survey method, also

of administrative significance is the related question: Will the utilization check results of the 1942 season provide a test of the accuracy of this grazing capacity figure?

The few comments, for which there is space at this time, should be considered as suggestions that may be of some assistance to those shortly to set out along an uncharted path.

The Yardstick

Both approaches begin with the gathering of field data with respect to some aspect of grazing during the 1942 season alone. Both require those data to be compared with a standard of performance before a judgment can be made concerning the ranchers' compliance with the practice. But the standard with which current livestock numbers must be compared is not the same as the standard against which the utilization check results must be measured.

The grazing capacity number, obtained by using the standard range survey method, is the yardstick against which the livestock count of grazing on the pasture during the 1942 season must be measured. If the livestock count, season end, is in excess of the grazing capacity number, the operator is not in compliance; if the livestock count is equal to or less in number, the conclusion is in the affirmative.

This approach proceeds to a conclusion entirely by mechanical steps, for all of the necessary judgments concerning the correct rate of use have been made at the time the estimates of the grazing capacity were made. This approach thus does not consider directly the forage crop of the 1942 season. Neither the size of

the crop nor the degree of grazing use to which that crop has been subjected need be considered in reaching the correct conclusion concerning the rancher's performance. Only the number of stock grazed and the number of livestock units of capacity are involved. The forage crop and the degree of use of the forage crop are indirectly involved, of course, in the grazing capacity estimate, but it is not the forage crop of 1942 nor for that matter of any other single season. The fundamental proposition, on which rests the grazing capacity estimate, is that there is one rate of stocking which, if adhered to—season by season, through good years and bad—will bring about the desired management objective.

A grazing capacity number, correctly estimated following the current interagency range survey instructions, is such a figure. The sights are set on cumulative, long-pull results, and for this reason the degree of grazing of the vegetation during any single season does not have to be determined. The persistent direction of the vegetation trend under the impact of grazing is the important thing and this is a development which unfolds with the passing of time. This statement of the grazing capacity theory is somewhat oversimplified, it is true, but qualifications must be treated at another time. The stock-count approach will not give satisfactory results unless the grazing capacity number has been properly determined.

On the other hand, the standard against which the 1942 utilization check results are compared is some predetermined amount of use of the current forage crop—a concept to

which is usually applied the term "proper use." If the forage of the pasture has been grazed not in excess of the degree allowed by the proper use standard, the rancher has qualified under the limited grazing practice.

The proposition on which the utilization check approach rests differs substantially from the alternative livestock-count approach. It is essentially this: If the vegetation is grazed not in excess of the proper use amount each and every season, the range will be maintained in or brought to the condition visualized by the management objective.

Comparisons

Both proper use and utilization checks have to do directly with one year's forage production. Specifically, they are concerned with the amount of forage production of the 1942 season and the maximum use to which that crop may be put. Accordingly, the number of animal units equal to proper use will differ from season to season. If the season's forage crop is large, it will require more animal units (number of head times days of grazing) to graze the forage down to the point of proper use than if the season turns out a short forage crop. Accordingly, the rancher will have to check his range from time to time during the season to see how his feed is holding out and when use nears the point of proper use. He cannot assume, as under the alternative approach, that it will be permissible for him to graze, full season, the number of livestock that he started with.

The yardstick—proper use—however, as yet has not been defined nearly as precisely as the yardstick—

grazing capacity (if properly determined). Moreover, the several methods of determining the degree of use of the forage crop still are very much in the experimental stage of development. Thus (as an administrative approach for use in determining ranchers' compliance) its experimental character should be recognized. No considerable difficulty will be experienced in classifying ranges that are unquestionably under used or over used. It is the border line cases, calling for a close decision, that are distressing.

In reaching a decision concerning them the administrative officer should be allowed the amount of leeway that is in keeping with the experimental nature of the approach and the approximate character of the annual measurements.

Both approaches are driving toward the same vegetation objective and if the sights are set on the long pull, both yield comparable results. But as applied to the single season, 1942, the approaches are quite different and yield neither identical nor comparable results.

When compliance judgments are reduced to terms of permitted annual numbers there is little probability that the two approaches will yield the same number. Moreover, the utilization check numbers will differ from season to season while the estimated grazing capacity number (within limits) will be constant. Until the growing season is well advanced it will be impossible to tell what will be the final proper use number. In short, a utilization check for the season 1942 will throw no light on the accuracy of a grazing capacity number determined by the use of the interagency range survey instructions.

Arkansas' Model LAND POLICY ACT

By WILLIAM J. COLEMAN. *The administration of Arkansas' Land Policy Act is a laboratory activity of interest to conservationists, agriculturists, and students of public administration. But more than that, it demonstrates the value of State-Federal cooperation.*



UNTIL RECENTLY, Arkansas was in the same boat as many States regarding tax-forfeited lands; nearly a third of Arkansas was tax-delinquent. But the State has pushed ahead by taking stock of the situation and enlisting Federal cooperation in working out a solution.

In 1938, Arkansas owned, or potentially owned, several million acres, all of it eligible for disposition under the traditional policies of redemption by former owners, donation to homesteaders, or sale at \$1 an acre. Land Office officials, however, had no information about the kind of land the State possessed or the ability of those acquiring this land to succeed on it; nor was administrative machinery available for obtaining this information.

Many families acquired land from which they were unable to dig out a living. They failed to pay their taxes and let the land again revert to the State. On the other hand, some persons who acquired State land reaped great profits because of valuable timber or mineral resources attached to the land, and in some cases the State lost millions of dollars.

But this particular situation is re-

versed today. By retaining mineral and timber rights, the State will be able to prevent great losses in revenue. Only recently the State leased hundreds of acres of tax-forfeited lands for development of oil and gas. The money in excess of the old price of \$1 an acre received during the first nine months of 1941 under the new administration is more than enough to pay expenses of the entire Land Office for 2 years.

Not Overnight

This new businesslike approach in administration of the State's tax-forfeited lands did not come about overnight. First efforts to attack the tax-delinquent land situation in Arkansas grew out of President Roosevelt's suggestion that the several State governors appoint Farm Tenancy Commissions. The Arkansas Farm Tenancy Commission in 1938 considered the tax-forfeited land situation to be one of its responsibilities. Accordingly, the Commission studied the situation, with the aid of Federal and State technicians, and made findings and recommendations that resulted in 1939 in the enactment of the Arkansas Land Policy Act.

The administration of the Act is vested in the Commissioner of State Lands and in the Land Use Committee of the State Planning Board. Their first function was to classify rural tax-forfeited land according to its suitability for public ownership, agricultural settlement through proper development, or immediate return to private ownership by sale or donation.

Under the Act, lands suitable for immediate return to private ownership can be sold or donated in family-size units, rather than in 160-acre tracts, as the law previously had provided.

The head of a family can homestead land from the State, provided that he has resided in the State for 5 years, owns no land, or at any rate owns no unit adequate for his needs, and has insufficient money to buy land. The homesteader is given a 2-year trial period to establish his qualifications and his intentions to operate the farm himself before a deed is issued to him. He is required to pay the taxes, to clear a certain acreage of the land, and to build a house and occupy it during this time.

Other farm land can be sold in family-size units at appraised value, rather than at \$1 an acre, as was the case before the Land Policy Act was adopted.

Land classified as unsuitable for immediate return to private ownership, but capable of settlement through proper development, can be transferred to the Federal Government for development and sale to deserving families. Other lands that cannot be properly developed for agricultural settlement are to be retained in public ownership and transferred to State or Federal agencies,

or to political subdivisions of the State, for use as forests, wildlife preserves, parks, floodways, or army defense areas.

In all cases where land is sold or donated, all coal, oil, gas, and mineral rights are reserved in the State. Mineral rights, together with the land, can be obtained by the former owner by redeeming rather than by purchasing the land.

A Model

Many students and leaders in agriculture and government consider this Land Policy Act to be a model measure. Nevertheless, the Act itself could not have done the job if certain supplemental measures had not made businesslike administration of Arkansas' tax-forfeited lands a reality. For example, titles to the tax-forfeited lands were often defective. As a consequence, the State could not hope to obtain the full value in selling land, and families who bought State land, cleared it, and built homes sometimes were faced with the possibility that former owners might claim the land and dispossess them. Moreover, the Land Use Committee was without funds to employ personnel to assist in classification, inspection, and appraisal activities.

Before the 1941 session of the Arkansas Legislature convened, interested individuals, State and local officials, and the Land Use Committee began to formulate measures by which the 1939 basic legislation could be implemented. In doing this, technical assistance was obtained from the United States Department of Agriculture.

All of the proposed bills were adopted by the Legislature. The principal measures provide:

That a decree of the chancery court in a suit brought by the State to quiet and confirm tax title in the State after the elapse of one year from the date of the decree shall operate as a complete bar to any attack for any reason whatsoever except when a person has paid his taxes (Act 423).

That those acquiring land from the State shall pay 10 cents an acre as costs for the confirmation suit. In the past, the State has paid special attorneys an average of \$50,000 a year for bringing these suits (Act 375).

That five appraisers may be employed by the Land Use Committee to assist it in classification, inspection, and appraisal of lands (Act 260).

That minerals of tax-forfeited lands reserved to the State under the 1939 Act may be leased or sold upon the advice of the Land Use Committee (Act 351).

Following adjournment of the legislature, the Land Use Committee was reconstituted. The Committee, which consists of eight State officials, six representatives of the Department of Agriculture, and two lumbermen, who all have special knowledge of the State's land resources, agricultural conditions, and farmers, immediately began to study land policy legislation to determine its powers and the policies and procedures that the Committee was to follow in administering tax-forfeited lands.

Policies and procedure soon were adopted by the Committee. The major one called for enlistment of aid from Federal, State, and local agencies and officials, and individuals who had information and understanding of the State's land and human resources.

The main function of these agencies and individuals is to assist in the classification of State land and in the purchase of land for agricultural development or for forests.

Other policies provide that land classified as suitable for farming may be donated to the head of a family who has resided in the State for 5 years, who does not own land, and who has insufficient money to purchase land. This area may be no larger than can be worked by his family, and no smaller than necessary to provide an adequate living for his family. Likewise, the head of a family residing in the State for 5 years who owns an area inadequate for his family's needs, may homestead land adjoining his farm provided that the area donated, together with what he already owns, does not exceed his family's needs and provided that he cannot afford to purchase the land. Homesteading is not permitted where it appears that excessive expenditures for providing public services would result.

The homesteader may not dispose of his land for 2 years following grant of the donation deed, which is issued upon expiration of a two-year trial period.

When land is sold, the price must be at appraised value rather than at \$1 an acre and preference is given to adjoining farmers who need additional acreage to make a unit of appropriate size and character for a balanced, single-family farm. Preference also is given to individuals over corporations, to residents over nonresidents, and to those who wish to farm the land themselves over those who desire it for some other purpose.

Because the State is without adequate resources to finance develop-

ment of unimproved land potentially suitable for agriculture, the Land Use Committee will encourage the Federal Government (for example, FSA) to finance this development. Other lands unsuited for immediate return to private ownership will be retained by the State and transferred to appropriate State or Federal agencies, for use as forests, wildlife preserves, parks, floodways, and for other public purposes.

Timber on State land will be sold so as to safeguard the public interest and to insure continuous growth by following a practice of selective cutting. Timber land located within the boundaries of National Forest purchase units will be sold to the Forest Service under conditions and terms agreed to by the Land Use Committee and the Forest Service.

Cooperation

Under the 1939 Land Policy Act, mineral rights were reserved to the State except where former owners redeemed their land. No provision was made, however, for the disposition of these mineral rights. The 1941 Legislature authorized the commissioner of revenues to sell or lease tax-forfeited land for mineral purposes upon the advice of the Land Use Committee. The policy of the Committee is to lease rather than to sell land for mineral exploitation.

To apply these policies most effectively in the administration of tax-forfeited lands, the Committee found necessary the full cooperation of Federal and State agencies. These can supply many kinds of information and help: Information on soil types; area classification maps showing recommended types of farming; farm and home plans; inspection and

appraisal work; soil conservation practices; photographs and farm records that indicate availability of land for farming; the development of proper forest practices; and finance families until they have become established.

Not all of the objectives have been realized. The Land Use Committee, however, is conscious of the benefits that will be achieved through cooperation of Federal, State, and local agencies in Arkansas in providing the people with a sound program in the administration of tax-forfeited lands. Already the Forest Service has offered to purchase tax-forfeited lands located in their two purchase units in Arkansas. The State Forest Service has assisted in classification of land for forest purchases and in appraisal of timber on land that the State has sold. FSA has developed authority for purchasing tax-forfeited land that may be reclaimed and made suitable for farming. Financial assistance is being given to homesteaders. SCS has made available maps showing classification of land in soil conservation districts.

Pioneer

Agricultural planning committees of the Extension Service and of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics are making land classification maps available. The Bureau also is providing technical assistance in land classification and appraisal work and in the formulation of methods and procedures for administering State lands. A study has been made of the experiences of several families who have homesteaded State lands.

In sum, Arkansas has pioneered in the realm of State-Federal cooperation in attacking problems primarily

of State concern. Her pioneering effort has been outside the usual setting of State-Federal cooperative endeavor, as typified by conditional grants-in-aid or the State enactment of enabling legislation necessary to facilitate the operation of Federal programs.

Thus history of Arkansas' land policy probably provides a unique example. Here, Federal assistance was sought in analyzing a State problem and helping to draft legislation necessary to solve it. Here, there was established a top administrative organization which, though

purely a State agency, was composed to a considerable degree of members of the Federal bureaucracy. Here, the State has deliberately sought to enlist the fullest possible measure of Federal advice and technical assistance in the grass roots administration of its program. Here, the State, rather than the Federal government, has taken the lead in attempting to secure cooperative State-Federal administration of public lands—under arrangements whereby the State furnishes the land, and the Federal Government the financial backing necessary for proper development.

Exchange

In the first place, so far (and I wish to speak of it no further), so far as the interest of Agriculture is concerned, its first demand on government is, after that protection (I do not use the word in a political sense), after that protection of the law which secures to every man the earnings of his own labor—after this the duty of government to agriculture is, to give an easy transmission of its products to the place of sale and consumption; because, in our climate—in any climate—human life, if we carry our ideas beyond mere necessity, calls for things, the products of other climates, the

fruits of the labor of other persons in other parts of the world; and therefore, there is always a necessity for commercial exchange for disposing of the surplus production of one climate for those of another, and thus, to become possessed of what are commonly regarded as the luxuries of life, but which are its comforts, and which are the products of the labor of different quarters. Therefore, one great object and duty of government is, to see that the products of the farmer may be easily and speedily transported to the place of consumption or sale.

—DANIEL WEBSTER



Books

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PLANNING, 1941. *American Society of Planning Officials*. Chicago. 357 pages.

by CAROLINE B. SHERMAN

TIME is of the essence in planning. This is the keynote. Brig. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell declared before the House Committee on Appropriations, last February, that "about \$100,000,000 could have been saved on the cantonment program if funds had been available for advance planning," but the nature of the emergency decreed otherwise. This direct statement rather than "rosy and lengthy statements which planners frequently are wont to present" opens this volume.

Brevity is another keynote here. The addresses and discussions are given in compact form. Readers feel they are getting the kernel of the conference and escaping tedium.

All the larger phases of planning are here considered. National policy, State and county land-use programs, land-use zoning, agricultural planning, and the rural-urban fringe, lead off with Federal and State workers as spokesmen. Industrial locations enlist speakers from the National Resources Planning Board, the TVA, the States, and industry itself. As an administrative process, planning is considered by leaders from the Bureau of the Budget and National and State Boards.

The difficult matter of city re-planning and rebuilding has its

share of attention which includes the report of a legislative victory in New York.

DEFENSE planning naturally has emphasis. But these considerations link it closely with the past and with the future. Industrial production from the viewpoint of a representative of the Federal Office of Production Management is bracketed with the considerations of men from the National Resources Planning Board, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the State economic staffs. Defense housing is linked with the over-all housing program and with neighborhood planning by the juxtaposition of the addresses by specialists in each field.

Programming public works includes planning for defense, for the post defense period, and for the future generally, all considered by enthusiasts. Then comes a sympathetic and reasonable reminder by a speaker from the Bureau of the Budget expounding the theory that fiscal policy should be geared to the requirements of the situation as a whole.

AFTER REPORTS of committees on such important matters as education for planners, planning

personnel, tax-abandoned lands, and urban redevelopment, the text swings into such broad subjects as hemispherical resources and cooperation, regionalism, and social aspects of regional development, followed by brief statements by experts on several of the great regional-plan-

ning undertakings—Columbia Power Authority, T. V. A., the proposed Arkansas Region, and the Delaware River Basin. A copy of the resolutions passed by the conference and a statement headed, What the A. S. P. O. Is, and a useful index close a spirited volume.

As I SEE IT. OBSERVATIONS OF A CIVIL SERVANT. 50 Essayettes of 150 Words. *Warner W. Stockberger*. The Graduate School, Department of Agriculture. Second Edition. 50 pages.

by ESTHER M. COLVIN

WITHIN the compass of his 13 years of experience with human relationships in the Department of Agriculture, Dr. Stockberger has met conservatism, gossip, the worship of "sacred cows," conditioned response, sharp practices, short circuits, stagnation, and incivility to the public. But he has also found friendship, loyalty, growth, respect for work, tolerance, and voluntary cooperation. These topics, with others, form the themes of the "miniature essays" contained within this small volume.

To this reviewer, certain of these vignettes, which will endear themselves to the reader by their very brevity and compactness, stand above the others. Some of these are the *Accident of Circumstance*, in which the author says that "the accident of circumstance is far more important than deliberate planning in shaping individual careers * * *"; his thoughts on *Attitudes* which, he says, "are not always logical, reasonable, justifiable, or sensible," but "* * * may become different with each change in relations or circumstances"; his advocacy of centrifugal interest in the work one has to

do, the kind of interest that "counteracts the dangers of extreme specialization, develops wider perspectives and provides a more dependable background for sound and reliable judgments."

SO, TOO, his essays on morale, perspectives, and point of view. Perhaps his definition of morale as "an attitude or state of mind which is reflected in behavior or conduct with respect to enthusiasm, confidence, courage, hope, loyalty, zeal and analogous feelings" will bear repeating.

Low morale, he believes, is "in general, an index of the degree of supervisory ability, or a symptom of untoward circumstances affecting the situation in which individuals are placed." As to perspectives, "an individual's own line of work may loom so large in his mind's eye that he can see little importance or value in the work of others." In *Point of View*, "who among us is wise enough to say that another's occupation lacks attractiveness?"

These small etchings of the differ-

ent phases of a "philosophy of work" are likely to be read and read again

by those to whom such a philosophy is of concern.

MARKETING COOPERATIVES. *Donald F. Blankertz.* Ronald Press. New York. 488 pages.

by HAROLD HEDGES

THE DEDICATION of this book "to the students for whom colleges are founded, faculties chosen, books written" is indicative of its specific purpose. The author accepts, as the most adequate approach to his subject, an evaluation of cooperatives as business institutions. His initial discussion of the origins and implications of the movement, however, goes well beyond that into its social and psychological aspects. Incidentally, this discussion offers evidence of exhaustive research into the background of the movement.

The author's attack is on a somewhat broader base than the title indicates, in that he has not limited his presentation to cooperative marketing alone. Following the opening chapters on origins and implications, he does devote a major portion of his book to marketing cooperatives, with main emphasis on farmers' associations.

He presents, in quite logical and interesting fashion, a discussion of such topics as types of associations, basic principles, and problems and policies as they relate to organization, membership, finance, pooling, sales and advertising, control of production, and legal structure. He then utilizes the commodity approach in a limited way to illustrate factors leading to organization, the nature of activities, and the results realized. Following this is a sur-

vey of the consumers' cooperative movement, including in it a discussion of farmers' purchasing cooperatives. He concludes his book with an analysis of the elements of weakness and success, and of the possibilities and limitations of the cooperative movement.

Mr. Blankertz's information on cooperatives in the United States appears to be reasonably comprehensive and accurate, and we may assume equal validity to his statements regarding the movement elsewhere in the world. Some slight inaccuracies in statements were noted, together with a few omissions which some readers may feel are serious. For example, no mention is made of the American Institute of Cooperation, and the cooperative literature resulting therefrom. Nor is the largest (in sales volume) of the American purchasing cooperatives, the Cooperative Grange League Federation, Inc., among those about which comment is made. His development of the revolving fund method of financing in his chapter on that subject may appear quite inadequate to some students of the subject.

FARM MINDED folk may object to the author's repeated comment on the individualism of the American farmer as a deterrent to cooperative development. Unknow-

ingly perhaps, his discussion carries the implication that it is more a farmer trait than an American one. In fact, the greater progress of the movement among farmers than among the urban population belies the implication. One might also question the author's repeated statement that the cooperative must be more efficient than private business to justify its existence. Would it not be enough to be equally as efficient, especially in view of his statements that the "cooperative way of doing business is of a high ethical quality" and has social impacts beyond its purely business aspects?

THE AUTHOR'S approach to his subject is not radically different from that of most other authors of cooperative marketing texts, despite

some variation in arrangement of topics and in emphasis. He adds to the completeness of his book as a text for a general course in cooperation by bringing in the discussion of consumers' and service cooperatives. It is to be regretted he did not go further in bringing his subject matter up to date. In some cases he brings in information indicating events as late as 1939 are included, whereas in other instances important developments since 1935 (the 1935 cooperative law of Iowa, for example) are omitted. On the whole, however, the reviewer considers it a valuable contribution as a text or source book, especially since it summarizes a wealth of historical information and background material regarding the cooperative movement.



Letters

Tenure Areas

SIR:

I should like to submit the following comments regarding the article *Who Are the Laborers on our Farms?* in the November LAND POLICY REVIEW. In it, Mr. William T. Ham criticizes an attempt in Louisiana to endow farm laborers with tenure status. With many of his comments I agree. Especially is it regrettable that the definition of tenure given in the Louisiana study does not refer to "property" in land. This institution is, of course, the essence of the term "tenure."

He also questions the methodology used in outlining "tenure areas" in the South. He is here criticizing something which is

in the development stage and which, therefore, is subject to criticism. He did not, in any instance, question the usefulness of "tenure areas" as an approach to a problem. In fact, this attempt at "arealizing" tenure problems appears to be a very sane approach to a problem which has been discussed for so long but about which too little has been done. Methodology for doing this job should take, and probably will take, into consideration more of the "property" aspects than was done in the studies which Mr. Ham discusses. Tenure areas properly begin with ownership and how the rights held by the owner (private, public, insti-

tutional, etc.) are divided with others regardless of whether these others are cash tenants, share croppers, laborers, or what have you.

In arguing against "tenure status" for farm laborers, Mr. Ham has drawn upon Ely and Wehrwein's "Land Economics" to support his point of view. However, he has misquoted, perhaps inadvertently, these reputable authorities. Mr. Ham's quotation reads, "The mere fact that land is used or cultivated by a person other than an owner does not mean legal landlord-tenant relationships."

This statement, from "Land Economics" published by The Macmillan Company, 1940, actually reads, "The mere fact that land is used or cultivated by a person other than an owner does not *always* mean legal landlord-tenant relationships." From the manner in which the authors used the word "always" in their statement, it appears that they were pointing out an exception rather than the rule.

As Mr. Ham points out, the laborer generally has no "rights" in the land as such. However, many states recognize a laborer's lien, or his right to crops produced to the extent of wages due him. This indicates that laborers have "rights" to a degree. He has one of the three property components as recognized by Roman law, namely, "jus frumenti," or the right to fruit from the land. After all, this is probably the primary right included in property rights. Without the right to the fruit from the land it is apparent that the other rights in the bundle would mean little in agriculture. In other words, rights in land mean nothing if they do not mean the right to the products of land. Also, in certain improvements on land it is reorganized that occupants or tenants making these improvements have a lien on the property object until satisfactory payment has been received. Mr. Ham concludes that "owner and tenant operators control the use of land and thus have tenure sta-

tus; hired farm workers have no control over the land on which they work, hence they have no such status." The right to use land is only one of the many rights which make up the entire bundle of rights. It would appear that to consider only this right in deciding whether a person or persons enjoy "tenure status" is as erroneous as leaving out the property concept in defining tenure.

For what it is worth, may I direct attention to the fact that most of the writings in land economics have included farm laborers as the lowest rung in the "tenure ladder"? Present trends appear to be toward giving the laborer at least the right to some of the fruits from the land. An example of this is Mr. Tolley's statement in a recent issue of *LAND POLICY REVIEW* to the effect that "all operators of small farms, tenants, sharecroppers, and *farm laborers* with stable employment ought to be eligible for a minimum payment under the AAA." Mr. Ham, although he probably does not recognize his efforts as such, proposed that employers share certain rights in that they should "be encouraged to consider their responsibilities to the public (he could have added 'and the employee') in connection with the social problems arising

Spark

Public regulation is just the spark plug we really need to make substantial and satisfactory progress in future Federal forest policies and programs.

—EARLE H. CLAPP

ing from their present employment policies" (Yearbook of Agriculture, 1940, p. 917). Throughout this article the reader is constantly confronted with the viewpoint that the factory laborer has no rights in the particular industry in which he works. I am sure that there are many industrial employers in the United States today who would brand as pure fiction Mr. Ham's contention that the factory laborer has no right other than the one to quit work. In fact, the employer does not have the right to tell a worker to quit. The right of firing, once wholly the employer's, now has been shared with the laborers.

Also, the factory worker certainly has some "control over the manner in which the establishment is run" when he is granted the right for shorter hours. These rights which have been transferred from employers to laborers or shared jointly fall in the almost-too-numerous-to-mention class. In other words, regardless of the specious reasoning in this article, industrial labor has fought for and won a share in a great many rights.

In concluding the article, the author poses the question, "Is anything gained by trying to demonstrate a common tenure status?" Perhaps not, particularly if the common status does not exist, and I will agree that this probably was not demonstrated in the Louisiana study but undoubtedly can be demonstrated. However, if farm laborers do not have the right to use land and, therefore, enjoy no "status" according to Mr. Ham, neither should they be grouped with industrial laborers who have achieved certain rights and must, therefore, have "status." In the meantime, types of tenure studies should continue, taking cognizance of these rights, certainly to the degree in which they exist.

—J. H. SOUTHERN, *Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Fort Worth, Texas*

SIR:

A good deal has been written recently of the need for a program to give social security to farm workers and to safeguard their wages and working conditions. We have seen considerable emphasis on the difference in status of farm wage workers and sharecroppers as contrasted with tenant farmers and owner-operators.

Are we on the most realistic ground in emphasizing this distinction, and in considering social security for one or two of these groups, rather than all four groups? Do not all four have a very substantial degree of "common interest" in social security?

Ramsey and Hoffsommer have attempted to establish a basis of common interest in land tenure. This, Mr. Ham endeavors, and rightly I think, to explode as an unsound theory.

But Mr. Ham's contribution leaves us where we were before—classifying the wage worker and sharecropper as primarily laborers, and implying that the tenant and owner are primarily entrepreneurs. This classification, certainly, is not conducive to "a larger sense of common interest" among farm groups. Nevertheless, if it truly represented primary facts we would have to be guided primarily by it in dealing with the "farm labor problem." Actually, does it not represent merely a secondary relationship?

Is not the primary fact this: That the vast majority of farm operators as well as wage workers depend chiefly upon their own labor power to make a living? Do not the rank and file of tenants and owner-operators spend most of their time at labor, and relatively little in the conventional pursuits of entrepreneurs (buying and selling, hiring and firing labor, etc.)?

Certainly, what most farm people get equals but a modest wage for their labor, regardless of whether it is calculated as interest, entrepreneurial profit, or as wages.

A large part, even of the owner-oper-

ators, cannot look to entrepreneurial activities for an adequate, independent living, when they are unable to use their own labor power. At such times their security, independence, and living standards crumble. Nor can they look to their farms for security and independence after they retire from active farm work. Most farmers do not attain a sufficient equity in farm, or other property to support them in old age.

What I say is largely based on expressions of my own relatives and friends who are small farmers. In recent years I have heard them voice a good deal of disappointment that social security, wage and hour safeguards, and work relief were benefiting wage-laborers, while the small farmer had nothing truly comparable to help him achieve security.

Then, thinking of the mortgage which they probably will not be able to pay off in their lifetime, or of their status as tenants, they ask: "How about our old age? We need a social security program that will take care of us when we are too old to work, just as industrial labor is cared for."

Even in the other phases—the problems of security and independence during the working years of life—the operators of most family-size farms have much in common with wage laborers. When disability or other misfortune makes them unable to work, their income shrinks below the level necessary for security and independence.

Many farm operators and wage laborers have a common problem of making an adequate living—of obtaining a reasonable purchasing power in exchange for their labor, whether the return is received as wages or as prices. Many farmers and wage workers have problems of seasonal unemployment and underemployment; they have a common interest in nonfarm work opportunities to supplement farm income.

Still another problem is that of conditions and hours of work. While the

farm operator may be more willing to put in long hours, he, too, is interested in having some leisure time. And today working conditions as well as wages are important in obtaining and retaining good farm labor. This applies to farm family labor as well as wage workers, because farm youth are attracted by the shorter hours and freedom from chores offered by industrial jobs.

The broad field of health, nutrition, and housing, also, is one in which the problems of wage worker and farm operator might be approached through a unified program, designed to meet the needs of all low-income farm people.

What has this to do with social security and working conditions for farm labor? Essentially this, I think: If we go ahead and develop a social security program for farm labor, and exclude the tenant and small owner as being entrepreneurs, we will be leaving unfilled a keenly felt want of farm operators. As one result, we may find the program opposed by small farmers. This might well serve the purposes of those whose tactics are to augment class animosities. But the purpose of democratic progress would be served better by an approach that recognizes the common interests of wage laborer and small farmer alike in social security and in better working conditions.

Another important consideration: Without a social security program that meets the needs of farm operators about the only practical way for a farm operator to insure his independence and security in old age is to strive for a farm large enough to support two families, the retired farmer as landlord, and an operating farmer. This may mean a farm larger than true family size, employing a good deal of labor. It means sharp competition among farm people to enlarge their farms, with the more aggressive and more fortunate individuals crowding other farmers off the land. Such pressure of farmers individually

Peace

Some persons say that a crash will follow this war. Because there was such a collapse after the first war, they believe there must be such a crash again. If we can win the war, we can win the peace too. If we really win the peace, there will be no crash, and now is the time to start planning to win the peace.

—CLAUDE R. WICKARD

striving for land can destroy the family farm as a truly democratic institution. It can lead to the ownership of our better farm lands by a minority of fortunate individuals, reducing a larger and larger proportion of farm people to a wage labor or tenant status.

On the other hand, with favorable prices, wages, and working conditions on the farm, with adequate opportunities to use their labor power with a comprehensive health, nutrition, and housing program, and with a social security program to insure the independence and security of farm people in disability and old age, at least some of the pressure toward larger-than-family size farms would be eliminated. Farm people with energy and ability in excess of that required to operate a family-size farm could direct their surplus time into cooperative and civic activities, instead of into narrowly selfish expansion of their individual business. They could do this without fear that

their own future security was being neglected or overlooked.

Thus, the emphasis in farm life could be substantially broadened, from a narrow striving for individual wealth, to the advancement of farming as a way of life, and toward a more full participation in cooperative and community activities. Not that a rural social security program would be a panacea for the land tenure problem, but it would remove the fear-of-insecurity incentive which now drives farm people to place an undesirable degree of emphasis on accumulation of wealth, enlargement of farms, and perpetuation of farms already larger than family size.

It is not my purpose to propose the details of a rural social security program, but to discuss the basis of common interest that makes it reasonable to develop a program to meet the needs of farm people. It may be of interest, however, to summarize what the program might include:

Old-age, disability, and unemployment insurance, financed on the basis of ability to pay, designed to insure a comfortable and independent level of living in old age, and to help farm people through periods of disability and unemployment.

A farm price and wage program designed to insure to both the farm operator and the farm wage-worker a fair return for their labor energy.

An integrated program designed to provide full and continuing opportunity for farm people to use their labor energy during the active years of life—conservation, planned abundance, and tenure improvement, plus rural industries and rural public works to supplement farm work.

Farm management planning designed to make possible shorter hours and improved working conditions for farm people.

A comprehensive health, nutrition, and rural housing program designed to meet the needs of all low-income farm people.

—ELLERY FOSTER, *Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Washington.*

Farm Consultants

SIR:

The article on "Farm Consultants" in the August issue of the *LAND POLICY REVIEW* has just come to my attention. I am very much interested in the proposals in this article, as it is in direct line with an experiment now being conducted by the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. on their Southwest Cotton Co. ranch at Litchfield Park, Ariz.

This project is designed to establish young men in farming under strict management policy quite similar to the program that you outline in your article. It has been in operation for 5 years now and many of the ideas set forth by you are now in operation on this project. We have 40 young men in various stages of training on the project. They serve 3 years apprenticeship period, after which they are given leases with an opportunity to later purchase the land, on property owned by the company (some 37,000 acres) with consultation management service throughout the purchase period.

We are in hopes that we can take another one of the large ranches owned by the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., located at Goodyear, Ariz., which is 4 miles south of Chandler in the Salt River Valley, and set up a project similar to the proposal you have made, for tenure on the tractors from 2 to 4 years, with instruction in connection with practical agriculture, farm management, farm finances and banking, as well as farm production.

Our agricultural colleges have utterly failed to train men for production profit agriculture. This function is probably not within their scope or ability to perform, as most agricultural colleges are set up to train scientific men who, of course, are badly needed in the industry of agriculture. They have, in a mediocre sort of way, attempted to train men for farm management and productive agriculture, but the conflict between the objectives or

production profit agriculture and scientific agriculture has created a series of compromises within the curriculum so that the outcome is a small number of production agricultural men. It would seem to me that the colleges should continue to train scientific men and do a good job of it and then turn the work of training production agricultural men over to those who could set up training centers, with land in connection, where men could actually be trained for productive agriculture.

It has been my good fortune to have had considerable experience in the management field, having organized and operated the Western Farm Management Co., now located in Phoenix, Ariz., and also having had charge of the Goodyear Ranch project at Litchfield Park, along with some 15 years of agricultural education work.

It may interest you to know that we are making a concerted effort this year to have our vocational agricultural teachers at the various locations set up two categories of courses, one called Supervised Farming, in which we intend to enroll from 15 to 20 young men who have had training in vocational agriculture in our school communities. We intend to give these young men instructions in farm management which you indicate in your article. In the second category we intend to set up courses in farm management for adult farmers who may care to come into our classes for help in farm management and if possible, we wish to attempt to organize them into cooperative associations for the purpose of helping them with finances, machine operating companies, and other aids which they may deem necessary. However, this is not going to be easy to do as many of our school administrators still feel that agricultural teachers are more valuable as teachers of biology, mathematics, chemistry, and other academic subjects for part of the school day rather than putting in their full days as local consultants in farm management and

agriculture production in their communities. We are going to try to change this system and use our agricultural teachers as local consultants. In the United States we have some 8,000 of these agricultural teachers, who, if relieved of many of the other nonagricultural duties in which they now engage, could do a rather acceptable job as consultants. However, we realize that these men need objective training for this new duty which you indicate.

It is our idea to set up teachers' improvement programs with heavy emphasis on this matter of taking over the duty of farm consultants in farm management. With this in mind we are attempting to hold at least one session a month with our vocational agricultural teachers to train them in the matters pertaining to this field of work.

I am quite sure that your article will be helpful in bringing this matter to the attention of our administrators in education and to our colleges of agriculture. I enjoyed your article tremendously and hope it may be the beginning of a new type of endeavor which will help farmers cash in on the two blades of grass which we have encouraged them to grow. It is now time that we teach them how to handle their money and their property as well as to increase their production.

—L. D. KLEMMEDSON, STATE SUPERVISOR, AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION, STATE OF ARIZONA.

SIR:

I have read with interest the article entitled "Farm Consultants" in the August issue of the *Land Policy Review*. The suggestion on page 24 has merit. Perhaps it would be unnecessary at first to have a farm in every county to demonstrate the soundness or unsoundness of "rather wide

departures from the present farming systems" but if there were even three or four such farms in each agricultural State, their influence would be widespread.

In many States the Government already owns some of the land needed. The old land purchase projects formerly supervised by Dr. L. C. Gray frequently contain sections that would be suitable and typical for the purposes you have in mind.

I hope you succeed in having some of these farms established in the South, as it seems to be the only effective way for overcoming custom, habit and the doubting Thomases. In fact many of those who are now forced to say something, would welcome a practical experiment where the costs, waiting period and ultimate returns could be reduced to greater certainty.

—B. M. GILE, PROFESSOR OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS, LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY.

One

Agriculture is interested in finance, is connected with business. The farmer uses capital. He employs labor. He toils with his hands. He is a heavy taxpayer. This proves that agriculture is the one mighty force directly interrelated and integrating itself into our entire national structure.

—LOUIS J. TABOR



For Your Attention

FARM FAMILY LIVING IN RELATION TO THE CIVILIAN SUPPLY AND PRICE SITUATION OF 1941-1942. Bureau of Home Economics, Department of Agriculture. 31 pages.

Prepared by the Family Economics Division of the Bureau of Home Economics, "these pages bring together economic facts from Government and other reports that are of special interest to workers concerned with the farm family's home-management problems."

Asked to enlist in the 1942 Food-for-Freedom campaign, farm families must also meet another challenge. "This challenge is to build up the health, strength, and morale of every family member and to achieve the kind of home, community, and national life that is worth defending. Every family must renew its efforts to improve nutrition and health, must weigh anew the worthwhileness of its leisure-time activities, and must see how best to participate in community and national enterprises. All these call for exercise of the science and art of homemaking in the broadest sense."

The supply and price situation of durable goods, of materials needed in operation of the house and the automobile, of foodstuffs, clothing and household textiles, and medical care, are discussed, and savings and taxes are briefly touched upon.

THE GENERAL PROPERTY TAX STRUCTURE AND IRRIGATED AGRICULTURE IN PINAL COUNTY, ARIZONA. O. O. McCracken and Frederick Arpke. Washington, D. C. United States Department of Agriculture. Bureau

of Agricultural Economics. 44 pages.

The study upon which this report is based was made to promote a better understanding of property taxation as a factor influencing the irrigated agriculture of Pinal County, and as a service to the County agricultural planning program in Arizona.

Following a brief section devoted to local considerations, the general property tax structure and local government organization of the county are discussed as to the tax base and taxes levied; tax rates and tax delinquency, public indebtedness, county receipts and expenditures, and school district receipts and expenditures.

FARM TAXES AND THE COST OF PUBLIC SERVICES IN RELATION TO LAND RESOURCES IN RINGGOLD COUNTY, IOWA. J. Lloyd Spaulding. Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station, Rural Social Science Section, Agricultural Economics subsection, and Bureau of Agricultural Economics cooperating. Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station Research Bulletin 288, pp. 321-394. Ames.

The objectives of this report are summarized as follows:

1. To measure the burden of taxes on farm property.
2. To analyze the process of assessment and its relation to the unequal incidence of the tax burden.
3. To investigate the possibility of local school reorganization in the interest of relieving the tax burden and to appraise the need for State aid for schools in the area.
4. To point out the need for improved road facilities.
5. To examine the effect of homestead credit as a device for tax relief on farm property.

FARMER COOPERATION IN NORTHERN ALABAMA. A PHYSICAL INVENTORY AND APPRAISAL OF COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR IN SIXTEEN COUNTIES. L. C. Salter and E. L. Morgan. Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 249. Auburn, Alabama. Issued in cooperation with Tennessee Valley Authority, Department of Agricultural Relations. 52 pages.

"This joint report by the Alabama Polytechnic Institute and Tennessee Valley Authority covers a study of farmers' cooperative associations in sixteen counties in northern Alabama." * * * The study is a segment of an extensive examination of cooperatives in the entire Tennessee Valley area, which is being carried on by the Authority and the Land-Grant Institutions of the Valley States.

The object of the study was to obtain information with which the Alabama Extension Service, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and other public agricultural institutions or agencies may more effectively plan and carry on activities having to do with the further development and efficient operation of cooperatives.

Of the cooperative associations in northern Alabama, 18 were found to be active—13 county exchanges, 2 strawberry marketing associations, 2 cotton gins, and a dry-mix fertilizer association—with more than 9,299 members, 8,123 of which were patrons. In addition, nonmember patrons numbered 6,309. The principal commodities bought for members were fertilizer, feed and seed, and the principal commodity marketed was strawberries. A small volume of poultry and hogs was handled.

CUT-OVER LAND OF NORTHERN IDAHO. Report No. 5, Migration and Settlement on the Pacific Coast. United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics in cooperation with Idaho Agricultural Experiment Station. Berkeley, California. 34 pages.

One of 12 proposed reports dealing with the problems of migration and settlement on the Pacific Coast, this report deals with a specific area in northern Idaho, in which these problems are found.

The first settlers came into the area about 1860 and were miners. They were followed by lumbermen and livestockmen who grazed their cattle on the prairies. Although early agricultural development occurred on the prairie lands, and agricultural development of the cut-over lands began about 1902, it was relatively unimportant until after 1925, following the decline of timber employment and the migration of settlers from other areas. In the period 1930-38 in the 10 northern counties the inward migration is estimated at 34,000 people. In 1939, 26 percent of these were reported as farm families. New settlement is concentrated in or near the large towns and in cut-over areas. Of these farm families, 60 percent have come from the Midwest drought area.

Problems faced by these settlers are many. The majority are buying their farms, although their cash resources are small. Most of the land they buy is unimproved cut-over land which must be cleared and improved. Family income is low with correspondingly low levels of living.

Rough log or frame buildings of three or four rooms are the rule.

Cream cheese production reported to the Census Bureau by United States plants amounts to 53,000,000 pounds yearly.

The United States food products industries use more than 4,500,000,000 pounds of sugar annually in manufacture of foods.

Forty-four million pounds of Swiss cheese are made annually in United States plants, less than a pound and a half per family per year.

The average sized farm in 1940 was 174 acres—up 17 acres in 10 years.

Farmers of the United States have a right to be proud of the record of production. Total agricultural production in 1941 will probably be 113 percent of the 1924-29 level, as compared with 105 percent of that level in 1936-40. We are expecting and working for a total agricultural production in 1942 that will be the greatest in our history. This will be true despite reduced plantings of wheat and cotton, of which we have large surpluses. The increase will come in meat and milk and eggs, the foods we most need.

—CLAUDE R. WICKARD

